UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

2015 Tereza Brožová

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

ÚSTAV ANGLOFONNÍCH LITERATUR A KULTUR

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

Zpracovala: Tereza Brožová

Studijní obor: Anglistika – Amerikanistika

Indiáni jako bezprostřední nebezpečí: Portrét Indiánů v příbězích zajatců

Indians as the Imminent Threat: The Portrayal of Indians in Captivity Narratives

Praha, 2015

Vedoucí práce: Prof. David L. Robbins

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a výhradně s použitím citovaných pramenů, literatury a dalších odborných zdrojů a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

I declare that the following MA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned, and that this thesis has not been used in the course of other university studies or in order to acquire the same or another type of diploma.

V Praze dne …….. Podpis……..

Chtěla bych poděkovat vedoucímu své diplomové práce Prof. Davidu L. Robbinsovi za trpělivost a ochotu a za cenné připomínky a rady, které mi pomohly k vypracování mé diplomové práce

I would like to thank Prof. David L. Robbins for his patience and for his highly-valued feedback and guidance for my research.

Abstract in English

This particular MA thesis concentrates on the portrayal of Indians in captivity narratives of the early seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the essential source material being *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*, first published in 1682. The thesis explores the relationship between Native Americans and settlers who saw Indians as a threat to their own existence and also as a threat to the western expansion. It also focuses on the confrontation of savagery and civilization from the point of view of common presuppositions and prejudices about the Native Americans that are very often depicted in several captivity narratives. Moreover, the thesis provides necessary definition of the genre of the captivity narrative with regard to the reaction of the reading public in the period of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

From the first arrivals of settlers and explorers the American continent symbolized a land of vast opportunities. Nevertheless, the continent not being fully explored was shrouded in a veil of mystery. Explorers and adventurers were fascinated by the extensive natural resources they found in the New World. Moreover, the New World was often called New Canaan or the Garden of Eden as it symbolized for the newcomers a possibility to start a new life. The coming settlers were impressed by the wilderness of the American Frontier which was a strip of land covered with thick forests and marshes. Crèvecœur, one of the most influential thinkers, called the coming settlers "the western pilgrims."[1] The settlers who came to the "virgin land" had to rely entirely on their own strength and resistance to the apparent hostility of their surrounding and to the potential danger of Indian attacks. It is stated that more than one hundred thousand Native Americans occupied the region of the Frontier and

[1] Edwin Fussell, *Frontier: American literature and the American West* (Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965) 7

included more than two dozen groups, varying in population from a few hundred to twenty thousand.[2]

The confrontation between civilization and savagery stood as a source material for many writers and thinkers from the early sixteenth to almost twentieth century. Adventurers and explorers gave rise to a common presupposition of Native Americans being illiterate and brutal, torturing and scalping the white settlers. These myths were partly based on truth, partly embellished for the attraction of the reading public. It has to be mentioned that most of the portrayals from this time were written not from the point of view of writer but from the point of view of explorer or ethnographer. Nevertheless, it was the diligence and determination to overcome all the struggles resulting from the confrontation of two different civilizations which were later the fundamental pillars of the new emerging American society.

The Indians were portrayed as brutal savages, illiterate and living according to the laws of nature. Moreover, white settlers saw the Native Americans as unable to adjust to the conditions of the white society and considered the Indians to be a threat. From the European perspective Columbus made a great discovery but from a Native American perspective, he began an invasion.[3] "The children of nature", as the indigenous people were sometimes called, did not understand the actions of the settlers and thus, they could not assimilate. Moreover, the Native Americans were very often regarded as the blocking force to the further western settlement.[4]

One of the source materials for the analysis of the current situation of the conflict between the white and indigenous civilization are the captivity narratives. The captivity narratives were accounts of the capture by savages, enslavement and estrangement from the

---

[2] Milnes, O'Connor eds., *The Oxford History of the American West* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) 116
[3] Milnes, O'Connor eds. 81
[4] John McWilliams, *The Last of the Mohicans: Civil Savagery and Savage Civility* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995) 52-3

family, and all aspects of the native civilization.[5] Most captives were English or Anglo-American Protestants usually from frontier regions. Richard Slotkin declares that the captivity narrative was also an "archetype of the American experience" as it "provided a way of addressing the fear and guilt that accompanied the emerging American pattern of profound mobility."[6] The Indians were devastating the settlements, scalping and killing members of the colonies, and burning the crops. Those who survived the attacks were taken hostage. Even though there exist accounts of male captivity narratives, the captivity narratives written by women were much more successful. The story of a captured woman was for the reading public much more attractive than a story written by a man. What is also important is the fact that women captives were central figures in many of the captivity narratives written by men especially during the eighteenth century when the captivity narratives shift from the actual account of the experience to the blending of the real with the fictive being published for profit.

Another interesting feature that I would like to explore in my diploma thesis is the fact that in the early captivity narratives, captivity suffering and final redemption were all part of God's plan, and the publication of these events was a Christian duty.[7] Some critics even mirror the captivity to the story of a spiritual progress. The captives went through separation and abduction, transformation which symbolized adoption and immersion into the Indian society, and the final step was mirrored in the release, escape or redemption and return to the family. Nevertheless, some captives chose the live among the Indians and some of them assimilated to the extent that they forgot the mother tongue and adopted the Indian culture.

---

[5] Lawrence Peskin, "Captives and Countrymen: Barbary Slavery and the American Public" *John Hopkins UP, 2009* Available at: <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/docDetail.action?docID=10389803&p00=peskin> 1

[6] Robert V. Hine, John Mack Faragher (eds.), *The American West: A New Interpretive History* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000) 65, 67

[7] David T. Haberly, "Women and Indians: The Last of the Mohicans and the Captivity Tradition" *American Quarterly* Vol. 28, No. 4 (Autumn, 1976) The Johns Hopkins University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2712539> 433

One of the first, and probably the most famous captivity narrative was written by Mary Rowlandson. Rowlandson, who was a wife of the leading Puritan preacher in the Lancaster colony in Massachusetts, published in 1682 *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs Mary Rowlandson* where she depicts her own captivity two years ago. Rowlandson depicts her own ability to endure and adapt as well as her shifting attitude toward her captors. Moreover, Rowlandson's account can be also analysed as one of the first travel books written by a woman and published in North America. Rowlandson employs the immediacy of the storytelling with the religious belief making her captivity narrative a useful device for understanding the Native American history.

Key words: Mary Rowlandson, captivity narratives, Indians, *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs Mary Rowlandson*, civilization, savagery

Abstract in Czech

Hlavním tématem této diplomové práce je zobrazení Indiánů ve vybraných dílech vyprávění zajatců. Stěžejním dílem pro analýzu a popis je dílo Mary Rowlandsonové, *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs Mary Rowlandson*, poprvé vydané v roce 1682. Diplomová práce zpracovává vztah mezi původními obyvateli Nového světa a bílými osadníky, kteří v Indiánech spatřovali hrozbu a překážku v další západní expanzi. Vyprávění zajatců se stala cenným zdrojem nejen pro historiky a etnografy, kteří si cení popisů divochů, jejich tradic či životních zvyklostí, ale také pro literární kritiky, protože představují jeden z prvních literárních žánrů, který vzniká na území nynějších Spojených států. Neméně významným žánrem jsou pak pro běžného čtenáře, kterému zprostředkovávají dobové předsudky a předpoklady, hodnotící Indiány jako pekelné ďábly neschopné civilizovaného života.

Diplomová práce samozřejmě poskytuje definici žánru a soustřeďuje se i na částečně odlišné pojetí vyprávění zajatců mužů a žen, respektive mužských a ženských autorů. Je také důležité zmínit, že v průběhu let se pojetí vyprávění zajatců vyvinulo z věrného popisu událostí ke zcela vykonstruovanému příběhu, který podněcoval nevraživost k původnímu obyvatelstvu a vytvářel typické předsudky. Tento fakt vycházel i ze zcela odlišného životního stylu původních obyvatel a bílých osadníků a zcela rozdílného hodnotového systému. „Děti přírody“, jak byli často Indiáni označováni, pak byli evropskými osadníky spatřováni jako méněcenní a negramotní tvorové, žijící pouze podle dravých potřeb a příkazů samotného ďábla.

Vyprávění Mary Rowlandsonové není významné jen pro svůj popis událostí, ale také pro náboženský náboj, které samotné vyprávění skrývá. Rowlandsonová používá část odkazy k Bibli, která jí v jejím zajetí byla jediným společníkem a díky níž dokázala přežít. V celém

díle se tak odráží značný náboženský podtext. Rowlandsonová, jako manželka puritánského kněze, také do svého díla přenáší patrný puritánský odkaz. Není proto překvapivé, že její dílo bylo často znovu vydáváno s jasným náboženským nebo politickým záměrem.

Diplomová práce se také částečně zabývá následným životem nejen Mary Rowlandsonové, ale zajatců obecně. Z vyprávění zajatců a historických pramenů je doloženo, že někteří zajatci si místo svého propuštění vybrali život s Indiány, protože během doby s nimi strávené dokázali s jejich životním stylem splynout natolik, že následně byli adoptováni do Indiánských kmenů.

Klíčová slova: Mary Rowlandsonová, *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs Mary Rowlandson,* vyprávění zajatců, Indiáni, osadníci, civilizace, divošství

Table of Contents

NARRATIVE

OF THE

CAPTIVITY, SUFFERINGS AND REMOVES

OF

Mrs. *Mary Rowlandſon*,

Who was taken Priſoner by the INDIANS with ſeveral others, and treated in the moſt barbarous and cruel Manner by thoſe vile Savages: With many other remarkable Events during her TRAVELS.

Written by her own Hand, for her private Uſe, and now made public at the earneſt Deſire of ſome Friends, and for the Benefit of the afflicted.

BOSTON:

Printed and Sold at JOHN BOYLE's Printing-Office, next Door to the *Three Doves* in Marlborough-Street.

Introduction

The fates of the indigenous peoples in North America seem to be remarkable, yet very often tragic. When we imagine a member of a Native American tribe we tend to be influenced by television and popular images of brave warriors, legendary chiefs, or mysterious medicine men. The history of the many tribes on the North American continent is, however, quite complex. Conceptions of the world according to the "white man" were very often contradictory to Native American conceptions of the world. A constant fight for independence and conflict between white settlers and Native Americans consequently evolved into one of the indelible parts of North American history. Even though the topic of Native American affairs needs to be handled with caution, accuracy and humility, it certainly deserves further scrutiny.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the estimated number of American Indians and Alaska Natives living in the United States in 2013 was about 5.2 million, thus representing approximately 2% of the total population of the United States.[8] Since the sixteenth century, the numbers of Native Americans were influenced primarily by contact with white settlers and the application of white settlers' rules and regulations. One of the popular military toasts during the Revolutionary era was: "Civilization or death to all American savages."[9] Cruelty, however, was to be found on both sides. The skirmishes and conflicts at the time of the "westward expansion" of white America made of the Frontier region a place where cruelty was rampant and where both white settlers and Indian inhabitants lived in constant fear of their lives. Native American culture was considered "uncivilized" and savage, and Puritan leaders even incited members of their communities to common presuppositions of Indian illiteracy, brutality, and savagery.

[8] <http://www.cdc.gov/minorityhealth/populations/REMP/aian.html>
[9] Quoted in Roy Harvey Pearce. *Savagism and Civilization* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1988) 51

There were, fortunately, thinkers who did not see Native Americans as incapable of civilization and chose to live peacefully among them. One of the defenders of Indian sovereignty was J. Hector St. John de Crèvecœur, who mentioned in his *Letters from an American Farmer* that Indians should not be considered savage only because they live in coexistence with the nature but that, rather, adhering to the rules of nature, they should be regarded as noble because: "the nearer men returned to Nature, the more abundant their lives and the greater their happiness."[10] On the other hand, few settlers ever tried to understand the complexities of Indian tribal systems, their social hierarchy, or their sacred rituals. Instead, they saw (as they were often conditioned to see) immorality and brutality which they used for justifying their own prejudiced policy.

This thesis deals with the topic of Native Americans with regard to records of early Puritans, precisely with regard to narratives of Puritan settlers who were taken captive during the time of the Puritan settlement of the Massachusetts Bay region. The major aim of this thesis is not to provide in-depth analysis of the captivity narrative genre in its full breadth, because the format of the thesis would be insufficient; rather, it is to provide analysis of the portrayal of the Indians with regard to Mary Rowlandson's captivity narrative and Puritan beliefs of the time inscribed in the narrative itself. It is, however, important to identify the features of the captivity narrative genre, so a relevant definition of the genre is provided in the first half of the thesis in chapters dealing with the captivity narrative and the Puritan captivity narrative. The thesis moreover focuses on the political and religious influence of Puritan presuppositions and prejudices on Rowlandson's text.

The captivity narrative provides interesting data about the historical perspective and cultural and ritual life of Native Americans. Nevertheless, we have to be careful as the authors of many captivity narratives blend the real and the fictive, either influenced by their religious

[10] Hector St. John de Crèvecœur, *Letters from an American Farmer* <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/4666/pg4666.html>

beliefs, or interested in the profit of their published work, embellishing the text for the reading public. As Richard Vanderbeets points out, the captivity narrative depicts the tale of an archetype initiate. Nearly all captivity narratives share features of suffering and torture, followed by rescue and redemption, and finally concluded with a return to civilization.[11] On the other hand, captivity narratives also provide interesting data about captives who either became so fascinated with the Indian way of life, or were taken at such an very early age, that they fully merged with the Native American society. Mary Rowlandson, however, maintains her Puritan conviction, and her narrative provides an influential and persuasive account of her suffering, after having been taken captive in 1675. Her ability to endure and adapt therefore marks her spiritual progress, which is only possible through the reading of Scripture.

As the thesis deals with the portrayal of Indians at the time of Puritan settlement, it is important to mention also some economic aspects of the daily lives of Puritan settlers and their Native neighbors. Many settlers maintained economic liaisons with Native Americans. Most of the trade in New England in the 17th century was dominated by fur, which the white settlers bartered for goods like knives, scissors, combs - goods very often unknown to Native Americans and which Puritans regarded as of limited utility. Among the more practical goods that the Indians learnt to exchange with white settlers were cloth and guns. The thesis therefore concentrates also on the effect of those newly acquired materials on tribal structure and Native American mentality in chapters on "The Fur Trade" and "The Cloth Trade and Tribal Status".

Regarding Native American society and mentality, white settlers were inherently baffled by the complexity of the tribal system, hierarchy among the members of the Indian tribe, and complexities of their religious principles. Despite the Puritan lack of comprehension, Indian everyday and festive rituals show how elaborate and enthralling their

[11] Richard Vaderbeets, "The Indian Captivity Narrative as Ritual," *American Literature* Vol. 43, No.4 (Jan., 1972) Duke University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2924653> 562

culture actually was. On the contrary, settlers perceived Native Americans as inherently evil, agents of Satan on earth. The presuppositions are dealt with in the chapters “Mary Rowlandson’s Suffering” and “The Brutish Fiend”.

The Captivity Narrative

The earliest Puritan literature is marked by a strong emphasis on individual self. Unfortunately, this self was never free as the soul was burdened with Original sin and the idea of predestination. For the Puritans, life was consequently perceived as a set of predestined causes and effects; as a predesigned allegory of salvation, purification, and damnation.

According to David T. Haberley, the genre of the captivity narrative remains isolated within American literary history, of more interest to biographers and ethnohistorians than to critics.[12] In general, it is a record of capture or attempted capture by the Indians. Some of the narratives deal with an attempt to capture that did not succeed. Some of them tell the stories of captives who remained for years with the Indians as adopted members of the tribe; some of them tell of bloody marches and narrow escapes. Most of the captivity narratives, however, make painful attempts to be accurate and some are even accompanied by affidavits, an affirmation of the provenance of the given text.[13] The affidavit can be also found in Mary Rowlandson's narrative, expressed in a very simple but clear sentence: "Written by her own Hand for Her private Use, and now made Publick at the earnest Desire of some Friends, and for the benefit of the Afflicted." Early Puritan narratives, moreover, depict the actual captivity, suffering, and final redemption as a part of God's plan. Furthermore, some narratives even emphasize their own involvement in the act, turning away from the Puritan belief by their deeds and thoughts. The publication of these narratives is then regarded as a Christian duty.[14]

As the frontier between fact and fiction was very vague, captivity narratives served as a means of giving evidence regarding life in the Frontier region, evidence of the clashes of

[12] Haberley 431
[13] Phillips D.Carleton, "The Indian Captivity", *American Literature* Vol.15, No. 2 (May, 1943) Duke University Press <http://jstor.org/stable/2920419> 169
[14] Haberley 433

cultures, evidence of the misunderstandings combined with skirmishes. A large proportion of the authentic texts were written by women. The tale of a woman deprived of the protection of husband or family, a woman in need of financial support, was generally considered more attractive to the reading public. It is also the reason why many male writers produced fictional captivity narratives in which the main protagonist was a woman. In those works, particularly, women suffered the cruelest torments. Moreover, the story of a captive woman was inherently more suspenseful than a story of a man taken by Indians.[15] What created the greatest suspense was the idea of the cruelest torments, the possibility of physical abuse, the idea that a woman would start to act like man and thus be defeminized, and also the idea of a forced marriage with an Indian which would mean the loss of their "whiteness".

Puritan leaders started to be aware of the fact that some of the colonial settlers had started to favor Indian life, befriended local inhabitants, or even decided to live with Indians as renegades. In order to prevent such acts, many ministerial leaders pronounced speeches that highlighted the fiendishness of the Native Americans and discouraged other Puritans from accepting the cultural distinction and from willingness to comprehend Indian customs and habits. In 1676 Increase Mather insisted that King Philip's War revealed God's displeasure at the Puritans' Indian-like heathenism:

> If we mind where [the troubles]began and by what instruments we may well think that God is greatly offended with the "Heathenisme" of the English People. How many that although they are "Christians" in name, are no better than "Heathens" in heart, and in Conversation? How many Families that live like "profane Indians" without any "Family prayer"?

[15] Haberley 434

> […] If we learn the way of the Heathen, and become like them, God will punish us by them.[16]

Such warnings placed a dual burden on Puritan captives. First, they could not succumb to Indianization lest they and their countrymen suffer further depredation. Second, more important, their capture suggested that they were already so "heathen" as to merit God's wrath.[17]

In 1691 Cotton Mather urged his readers to:

> think upon miserable Captives now in the Hands of that bruitish Adversary; *Captives* that are every minute Looking when they shall be Roasted Alive, to make a Sport and a Feast, for the most Execrable Canibals; Captives , that must Endure the most bitter Frost and Cold, without Rags enough to Cover their Nakedness; *Captives*, that have scarce a bit of meat allow'd them to put into their Mouthes, but what a Dog would hardly meddle with; *Captives*, that must see theire nearest Relations butchered before their Eyes, and yet be afraid of Letting those Eyes drop a Tear upon the most Heart breaking Occasions, that can be imagined; *Captives*, that may not bear a part in any Comfortable Devotions, nor be known to have so much as a Bible with them , lest a French Priest should sieze upon it; *Captives*, that wear away one weary week after another, in the midst of such Wolves as are every moment ready to tear them all to pieces.[18]

[16] In Alden T. Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism: Essays on Colonial Experience*, (Cary, NC, USA: Oxford University Press, 1995) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10279471> 243-4
[17] Vaughan 244
[18] In Vaughan 243

The tales of captivities should induce repentance, discourage dispersion, and inspire those who would venture forth to new settlement to establish churches in their midst.[19]

The wilderness seemingly provided enough space for both native inhabitants and the coming settlers but the intolerance and fear fuelled with misconceptions and prejudices caused severe blows on both sides. Let us now examine some statistical data. From 1675 to 1763 the age, sex, and status of captive New Englanders varied with the ethnic composition of the forces who took them. Therefore, it was necessary to distinguish between captives of the Indians and captives of the French, and among the latter, between captives primarily of Canadians and of French regulars. Many of the prisoners were taken by combined French and Indian forces, and at some stage in their captivity, most prisoners were exposed to both cultures.[20]

Consequently, French patrols captured adult male European-Americans, most of them combatants, and took prisoners only during declared wars. In contrast, Indian war parties took primarily civilian prisoners and seized persons of all ages and both sexes. Less than seven percent were also professional military men, even though the number seems to be misleading as at that time almost any person could use a gun, even if s/he was not a professional soldier. Despite the arguments of some historians, Alden Vaughan disagrees when he states that Indian war parties, at least in New England, did not take primarily women and children. Nearly two-thirds of the Indians' captives, Vaughn insists, were males, half were adults, and war parties seldom seized a child less than two years old. One of the reasons why they did not include young children or women was because they probably knew that they might be pursued by Anglo-American forces. The second reason was highly economical and opportunistic. As the prisoners could be sold to the French for a bounty, Indians preferred

[19] Tara Fitzpatrick, "The Figure of Captivity: The Cultural Work of the Puritan Captivity Narrative" *American Literary History* Vol. 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1991) Oxford University Press <http://jstor.org/stable/489730> 5
[20] Vaughan 229-230

captives who could survive a long distance trek. Those who could not make a quick exit and stand up to the rigors of wilderness travel, namely the old, infants and the sick, were likely to be killed on the spot rather than taken prisoner.[21]

[21] Vaughan 232

The Puritan Captivity Narrative

As was already mentioned, Puritan society believed in the predestination of their fates and daily actions were seen as part of God's complex plan. The individual was bound by a set of rules and regulations and needed to lead his life in accordance with Scripture and the Church. Moreover, Puritan leaders and ministers possessed a great amount of actual power and every deviation from Scripture or their demands was punished. The absolute greatness of God was emphasized by daily reading of the Bible, which individuals tried to mirror in their lives, actions, and opinions.[22]

Even though the colonists struggled to civilize or even Christianize native inhabitants, there were very few Europeanized Indians in the period of the seventeenth century.[23] Colonial spokesmen blamed their meager success on circumstances such as the language barrier, shortage of funds and personnel, the inability to distinguish between Indian sachems and shamans, and especially on the Indians' infinite distance from Christianity. Moreover, the records of Christianization of Indians are sparse. The idea of the Puritans' being "the Chosen people", however, resulted in some efforts to impose their religious principles on all Indians in order to make them observe their laws and customs and turn them into so-called "praying Indians."[24] Such conversion was nevertheless based on the idea that the Puritan society is superior, based on the common misjudgments and incomprehension of the Indian customs. The Indian religion was conceived by the white man as amorphous. In other words, Indian spirituality was not based on a belief in an omnipotent creator but was based on the idea of numerous deities, occurring in every part of nature. Consequently, white settlers were not able

[22] Justin Quinn ed., *Lectures on American Literature*, (Praha: Nakladatelství Karolinum, 2011) 42
[23] Vaughan 216
[24] Jakub Kašpárek, *Puritans and Indians – Cultural Conflict in the 17th century New England* <https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/detail/88478> 50

to perceive the complexity of Native American spirituality and misunderstood Native American belief concepts.

The presumptions had their decisive role in deciding about the possibility of a harmonious life with Indians in the Frontier region but those presumptions were very often embellished for the purpose of Puritan ministerial leaders. Increase Mather, in his *A Brief History of the War with the Indians in New England*, provides a passionate portrayal of the circumstances of Indian alliances and doubts whether these are in accordance with God's will when he states:

> That the Heathen People amongst whom we live, and whose Land the lord God of our fathers hath given to us for a rightful Possession, have at sundry times been Plotting mischievous Devices against that part of the English Israel which is seated in these goings down of the Sun, no man that is an Inhabitant of any considerable standing, can be ignorant […] And whereas [the Indians] have been quiet until the last Year, that must be ascribed to the wonderful Providence of God who did […] lay the fear of the English, and the dread of them upon all the Indians. […] Nor indeed had [the Indians] such advantages in former years as now they have, in respect of Arms and Ammunition. […] Nor were our sins ripe for so dreadfull a Judgment, until "the Body of the first Generation" was removed, and another Generation risen up which hath no so pursued […] the blessed design of their Father, in following the Lord into this Wilderness, whilst it was a land not sown.[25]

[25] Amy Schrager Lang ed., *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* In Williams Andrews, Annette Kolodny eds., *Wisconsin Studies in Autobiography. Journeys in New Worlds: Early American Women's Narratives*, (Madison, WI, USA: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10531134&ppg=6 > 13

Mather talks about "a rightful Possession of the land the Lord had given to [them]" but the imposed superiority of the white civilization caused severe fights and losses on both sides. Alfred Cave comments on problems with the land ownership as he proffers several propositions. The first proposition states that the colonists were robbing the Natives of their land either by seizing it outright or by purchasing it in return for worthless items. The second proposition says that while the Indians willingly sold their land to the white man, they had no clear understanding of the implications such transaction had.[26] In other words, Puritans refused to recognize the legitimacy of Indian claims to hunting grounds or uncultivated lands. They even created legal documents which emphasized the Puritan divine right to the land as can be found in the concept called "vaccum domicilium", created by Massachusetts Governor Winthrop. In this legal document, he declared that the Indians had not "subdued" the land, as they have not, according to "the Principle in Nature", taken possession of a "vacant soyle, and bestoweth culture and husbandry upon it". In other words, all uncultivated lands, according to English Common Law, could be considered a certain "public domain".[27]

Consequently, most Puritans viewed Indians as dangerous but temporary obstacles to their permanent settlement in New England. They also considered Indians incapable of any potential partnership as they derived their thoughts from the projection of the Scripture in their daily lives and borrowed the rhetoric and imagery of the Old Testament, drawing parallels between them as "the Chosen ones" following God's divine call to "smite the Canaanites and drive them from the Promised Land". Roy Harvey Pearce provides a similar analysis when he states that "the Indians possessed their lands only as a natural right, since that possession existed anterior to and outside of a properly civilized state and since that

[26] Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996) 105 in Kašpárek
[27] Kašpárek 36, 40

possession was not in accordance with God's commandment to men to occupy the earth, increase, and multiply […] the English were obliged to take over."[28]

[28] Roy Harvey Pearce, "The *Ruines of Mankind*: The Indian and the Puritan Mind," *Journal of the History of Ideas* Vol. 13, No.2 (Apr., 1952) University of Pennsylvania Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2707611> 202

Mary Rowlandson

The captivity narrative of Mary Rowlandson is one of the most important captivity narratives from the period of the seventeenth century. Since its publication in 1682 it has been republished over thirty times, and each publication, essentially in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, contained certain political or religious purpose. Being the wife of a Puritan preacher, her position in Puritan society was intended to be patient and silent. However, due to her captivity experience and the fact that she maintained close relations with very influential Protestant minister Increase Mather, the publication of her narrative could also become highly influential, and thus it was Rowlandson's Protestant duty to depict her suffering in captivity. Nevertheless, it would be absolutely false to assume her story was that simple; so let us now deal with Mary Rowlandson's life for a bit.

Mary White Rowlandson was born to John and Joan White in Somerset, England, around 1637 and was raised from infancy in New England, living first in Salem, Massachusetts, and then in the frontier town of Wenham in Massachusetts.[29] It can be stated that the White family was among the most influential members in Massachusetts society, as John White was the wealthiest landholder in the region. In 1656, Mary married the English-born, Harvard-educated Joseph Rowlandson who served as the first minister in Lancaster.

The land was troubled with a continuing war between New English colonials and a combined force of Indians when in February of 1676, Mary Rowlandson, together with some of her children and her sister's children, was attacked and saw her close relatives and neighbors slaughtered in one of the Indian raids. Mary Rowlandson was then taken captive by

[29] Amy Schrager Lang, *Mary Rowlandson* Emory University <http://library.uvm.edu/~pmardeus/honors/dlbrowlandson1.pdf> 304-305

a group of Wampanoag, Nipmuc, and Narragansett Indians.[30] At the time of the attack, Joseph Rowlandson and his brother-in-law, Henry Kerley, were en route to Boston to plead with the colonial government for Lancaster's protection. Eventually, she was freed after eleven weeks in captivity in exchange for goods valued at £20 and later on, even her son Joseph was released by the Nipmucs and her daughter Mary was brought to Providence by an unidentified Indian woman. While the text suggests that £20 was a middle figure, critics like Richard Slotkin claim that it was actually rather high. Based on the historical evidence of valuation of land and property it can be claimed that it was certainly higher than that of any of the other captives.[31]

Lancaster had by then been destroyed, and the Rowlandsons spent the following year in Boston, being supported by close friends and loyal Puritan believers. In the spring of 1677, the Rowlandsons moved to Wethersfield, Connecticut, where Joseph Rowlandson was called to the ministry. He died the following year at the age forty-seven.[32] It was believed for a long time that Mary Rowlandson did not outlive her first husband for a long time, but the historical data show that Mary Rowlandson remarried nine months later, to a Connecticut leader, Capt. Samuel Talcott, and died on 5 January 1711, at the age of seventy-three.

The captivity narrative was written shortly after the arrival in Wethersfield in 1677, highly encouraged by Reverend Increase Mather, who was the minister of the Second Church in Boston and a prominent political leader in the Massachusetts Bay colony. However, it was not published until 1682, when it was published four times in both Boston and London, with

[30] Teresa A. Toulouse, *Captive´s Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England* chapter 2 "The Sovereignty of Goodness of God in 1682: Mary Rowlandson´s Narrative and the "Fathers´" Defense (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10748629&ppg=30> 21

[31] Teresa A. Toulouse, "My Own Credit": Strategies of (E)valuation in Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative", *American Literature* Vol. 64, No.4 (Dec., 1992) Duke University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2927633> 658

[32] Schrager Lang 305

changes both in the title and content. The American title of the narrative published in 1682 was

> *The Soveraignty and Goodness of God, Together with the Faithfulness of His Promises Displayed; Being a Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson Commended by her, to all that desires to know the Lords doings to, and dealing with Her. Especially to her dear Children and Relations.*
>
> *Written by Her own Hand for Her private Use, and now made Publick at the earnest Desire of some Friends, and for the benefit of the Afflicted.*[33]

As the English audience may have been more interested in other features of the narrative than the American audience, whose target was highly religious, the English version bears the title

> *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson, A Minister's Wife in New England. Wherein is set forth, the Cruel and Inhuman usage she underwent amongst the Heathens, for Eleven Weekstime and her Deliverance from them.*
>
> *Written by her own Hand, for her Private Use: And now made publick at the earnest Desire of some Friends, for the Benefit of the Afflicted.*

The London edition includes Increase Mather's preface called *Per Amicum* and Joseph Rowlandson's last sermon, preached in Wethersfield, Connecticut, on 21 November 1678.[34] In his preface, Mather presents Rowlandson's story to the wider public, comments on the destruction of Lancaster, and highlights the role of Mary Rowlandson in strengthening the belief that Puritans are the Chosen ones, ready to face the evil enemies in order to cultivate the land in God's name:

[33] Toulouse 22
[34] Schrager Lang 306

> The works of the Lord (not only the Creation, but of Providence also, especially those that do more peculiarly concern his dear ones, that are as the Apple of his Eye, as the Signet upon his hand, the Delight of his Eyes, and the object of his tenderest Care) [are] great, sought out of all those that have pleasure therein. And of these verily this is none of the least.

Mather, however, pays careful attention on the maintenance of Rowlandson's role as the author and the Puritan symbol of endurance and Puritan devotion when he inserts a disclaimer in the actual text of his *Per Amicum*, thus seemingly not providing any comments on the narrative or giving it any special purpose:

> But it is not my business to dilate on these things, but only in a few works introductively to preface to the following script, which is a Narrative of the wonderfully awfull, wise, holy, powerfull, and gracious providence of God, towards that worthy and precious Gentlewoman, the dear consort of the said Reverend Mr. Rowlandson, and her children with her, as in casting of her into such a waterless pit, so in preserving, supporting, and carrying thorow so much extream hazards, unspeakable difficulties and diconsolateness, and at last delivering her out of them all, and her surviving children also.[35]

The London edition also corrected minor omissions and errors and is generally regarded as the most reliable version of the text. It is also interesting to mention, what Kathryn Zabelle Derounian points out, that only eight leaves of the original first Boston

[35] Mather P*er Amicum* in Mary Rowlandson, *Soveraignty and Goodness of God* <mih.umd.edu/eada/Huml/display.php?docs=rowlandson_narrative.xml>

edition exist. These leaves are bound into the first edition of Samuel Willard's *Covenant Keeping*, published in Boston in 1682.[36]

The narrative became influential right after its first publication in 1682, then was republished in 1720, three times in 1770, once again in 1771, and twice in 1773. With one exception, all the editions which appeared during this period were published in Boston. The place of publication is also in this case of special purpose. The political situation in New England was literally projected into this particular captivity narrative as it mirrored the actual situation of white settlers being taken captive by the Old Continent English rule. In 1770, Boston was a captive city, having been occupied by British troops since October 1768. The soldiers had been sent to restore order in the face of civil unrest over the Townshend Acts. Violence, now known as the Boston Massacre, erupted on 5 March 1770. In calling this incident a "massacre", the colonists were calling up images of the kind they knew best, the Indian raids on a frontier settlement, implying that the British, in firing on unarmed citizens, shared something of the Indians' fiendishness.[37]

It was not only Rowlandson's account of events that was popularized because it expressed the colonists' growing sense of themselves as people held captive and represented a certain sort of resistance and patriotism. As Native peoples resisted the expansion of the United States into their homelands, such as the Ohio Country in the early 1790s and the Indian Territory between 1809 and 1811, John Williams's captivity narrative was used to fuel Americans' fears of the Indians. Even though Williams's narrative, published in 1811 as *The Captivity and Deliverance of Mr. John Williams, Pastor of the Church in Deerfield*, posed as a real account of events, Williams, the male captive, had never been taken captive by Indians and his fictive narrative was designed to exacerbate prejudices against Native Americans.

[36] Toulouse 178
[37] Greg Siemenski, "The Puritan Captivity Narrative and the Politics of the American Revolution," *American Quarterly,* Vol. 42, No. 1 (Mar., 1990) The Johns Hopkins University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2713224> 37-38

Teresa A. Toulouse observes, however, that while other narratives address the literal and metaphorical meanings of the possible seduction of the captive woman, only Williams, the male captive, makes seduction the central obsession not just of his captivity narrative, but of every other title he writes.[38]

It can be generally said that a large proportion of the authentic narratives of captivity were written by women. Stories depicting women deprived of the protection of husbands or families, in need of the financial support, proved of interest to a potential reading public. Female captives thus served as central figures in many captivity narratives produced by men.[39] In those works, women suffered cruel torments and the topic was inherently more dramatic as a woman could be tormented, raped, forced into marriage with an Indian, or defeminized. The literal as well as textual replacement of the orthodox woman by man in Williams's work thus demonstrates the end of the late seventeenth-century Puritan captivity's capacity as a cultural form to produce and sustain a particular kind of ambivalent male identity. Rowlandson, however, never mentions any kind of sexual abuse or attack on her and therefore opposes common Puritan presuppositions:

> I have been in the midst of those roaring Lyons, and Savage Bears, that feared neither God, not Man, nor the Devil, by night and day, alone and in company: sleeping all sorts together, and yet not one of them even offered me the least abuse of unchastity to me, in word or action.

Therefore, in Rowlandson's case, it was not physical abuse that she feared most but the possibility of moral downfall.

[38] Toulouse chapter 1 "Female Captivity, Royal Authority, and Male Identity in Colonial New England, 1682-1707" 18
[39] Haberley 434

Indians East and West of the Mississippi River

For our analysis of the Rowlandson text and the correctness of our findings, it is necessary to outline the distinction between the tribes east and west of the Mississippi River. During the early periods of encounters between Indians and the coming settlers, the many nations and tribes could be divided into two groups. Between eastern Canada and the Carolina coast, prevailed Algonquian speakers, down to North Carolina. These included the Abenakis and Pequots in New England and the Delawares and Powhatans to the south. Iroquoian speakers dominated the inland region extending west through the Ohio Valley. The most prominent here was the League of the Iroquois, including the Cherokee enclave. The Upper Mississippi Valley, including the Great Lakes region, was dominated by Algonquians like Ojibwas or Chippewas.[40]

Despite the variety of tribes on the North American continent it is also important to mention something about the very origin of Indians. The origin of the name "Indian" probably comes from Christopher Columbus who is considered to be the first person to use the name "Indian". After the arrival to the New World, Columbus called the inhabitants *los Indos* because he mistakenly thought he had arrived in the East Indies. Within a half-century "Indian" had been adopted to English and it came to refer to all Native Americans. The theories on the origin of the Indian tribes on the American continent differ, but the most probable is a theory mentioned by Robert Hine and John Mack Faragher. These authors stated that the Indians were descendants of ancient hunters who had migrated from Asia to America

[40] Thomas N. Ingersoll, *To Intermix with Our White Brothers: Indian Mixed Bloods in the United States from Earliest Times to the Indian Removes,* (Albuquerque, NM, USA: University of New Mexico Press, 2005) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10492235> 43

across the Bering land thirty or forty thousand years ago and these tribes consequently had spread over the continent and inhabited the land.[41]

Even though there existed a language barrier, as the many tribes used their own dialects and variations of their particular common language, some features of their tribal life seem to be very similar. At the time of the European contact, none of the Indian tribes made metal items, none used distilled spirits or peyote, but they all cultivated and smoked *Nicotiana rustica*; all practiced therapeutic water vapor sweating and the dominant mode of subsistence was the cultivation of plant foods, or horticulture, which was supplemented by hunting and fishing. Even though European settlers often perceived the position of women among the Indian tribes as low, the truth is that their social status was quite high. Local women were in charge of most cultivation; men, on the other hand, were in charge of house building, and some individuals were even specialized craft workers.[42]

The position of women in Indian tribes might have been confusing for early settlers, so it deserves further mentioning. Colonists believed that local women were limited to only the most taxing and unpleasant labor, especially field-labor. John Long at that time stated that: "the [Iroquois] men consider women as of no other use but to produce them children, and to perform the drudgeries of life; as to the offspring, [the Iroquoian man] prefers the sons."[43] Colonists very often ignored contrary evidence.

Most appreciated was the evidence given through the descriptions by white captives, for example by one of the most knowledgeable eighteenth century missionaries, John Heckewelder who provided a persuasive refutation of the slavery of Indian women, when he described Indian domestic relations as a set of complementary compromises. The actual position of women among Indians was quite high as they could exercise a remarkable degree

[41] Hine, Faragher 3
[42] Ingersoll 44
[43] In Ingersoll 46

of political power. Indian women controlled their family's food supply and their own bodies, both before and after marriage and they represented the major producers of family income. Mary Jamison, a white captive who married a Seneca warrior and spent a long time with the Indians, commented upon Indian habits: "Notwithstanding the Indian women have all the fuel and bread to procure, and the cooking to perform, their task is not harder than that of white women, who have those articles provided for them."[44]

What is even more interesting is the fact that one domain in which both Algonquian and Iroquois women had the priority right to decide was the torture and adoption of captives. Parties of women, usually older women, commonly greeted captives upon their arrival at an Indian village or fort. These women consequently decided which captive would live and which captive would die in ritual torture and sacrifice, which captive would be tortured just slightly and which would be adopted and by whom; moreover, they even decided what the captives' role in their new families would be.[45] Another source mentions that the torture of prisoners had its own significance in ritual procedures. Armstrong Starkey mentions that the Shawnees (even though the contact with the Shawnees came considerably after the Puritan period) possessed two sets of female "chiefs", one for war and one for peace. If women of the war society touched a prisoner first, he was burned and eaten.[46]

As the Puritans inherently inclined towards misjudgments and misreading of Indian customs, they hardly ever gained insight into the complex Indian hierarchy. According to today's evidence, Indians were organized into a large number of villages, based on kinship, each under one sachem or sagamore.[47] Chiefs were usually men, though on occasion women succeeded to sachemship. Even though sachems were not really omnipotent, many enjoyed

[44] In Ingersoll 47
[45] Ann M. Little, *Early American Studies: Abraham in Arms: War and Gender in Colonial New England,* (Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10492235> 101
[46] Armstrong Starkey ed., *European and Native American Warfare 1675-1815,* (London: Routledge, 1998) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10054943&ppg=6> 30
[47] Kašpárek 20

enough power to rule. The office of sachem was semi-hereditary, and the Puritans often perceived the Native tribes as essentially monarchial, having a single ruler, whose authority rested on family descent and in part of satisfying the leadership needs of the people. Personal qualities had, however, a sometimes decisive function, since combined with hereditary rights they could influence the election of the new chief. Contrary to the assumptions of the Puritans, below the chiefs was a variety of subordinate sachems who ruled over subdivisions of the tribe, such as war captains or powwows (medicine men), and many others.

What is also interesting is the fact that despite their very often brutal capture by Indians, most white captives who lived to publish their stories happened to identify their captors as their "masters". In other words, captives placed themselves in a subordinate position. Ann M. Little even mentions that it was important for the captives to identify the leader of the raiding party as their new household government.[48] The decision of subordination was not made after careful study or reflection on their place in their new families, but the captives rather assumed for themselves the status of servitude based on their understanding of English household organization. Female narratives very often stress their position as mothers being deprived of their children. They were, however, not entirely deprived of their status as mothers. In fact, many women captives were surprised and grateful for the consideration Indians showed for their young babies, giving them time and assistance in nursing them.[49]

However, even motherhood had limited powers in captivity. Most of the captive mothers lost their children not just to disease and death but suffered their children being sent away to other Indian families and communities. In Rowlandson's narrative we can find many instances when Indians either help her with her wounded child or laugh at her, when she tries to find a little comfort for her dying child:

[48] Little 91, 109
[49] Little 106

> One of the Indians carried my wounded Babe upon a horse; it went moaning all along "I shall die". I went on foot after it, with sorrow that cannot be exprest. At length I took it off the horse, and carried it in my armes till my strength failed, and I fell down with it: Then they set me upon a horse with my wounded Child in my lap, and there being no furniture upon the horse back, as we were going down a steep hill, we both fell over the horse head, at which they like inhumane creatures laught, and rejoiced to see it, though I thought we should there have ended our days, as overcome with so many difficulties.

Even though Rowlandson calls them "inhumane creatures" she consequently, after her child's death, narrates that even Indians felt the loss of a child as a loss of a part of the mother's soul:

> Thus nine days I sat upon my knees, with my Babe in my lap, till my flesh was raw again; my Child being even ready to depart this sorrowfull world, they bade me carry it out to another Wigwam. […] About two houres in the night, my sweet babe like a Lamb departed this life. […] I went to take up my dead child in my arms to carry it with me, but they bid me let it alone: there was no resisting, but go I must and leave it. […] when I came I askt them what they had done with it? Then they told me it was upon the hill: then they went and showed me where it was, where I saw the ground was newly digged, and there they told me they had buried it.

What is, however, striking is the fact that when Rowlandson lives with the Indians and sees the death of an Indian child, she does not recall her own loss of a child but rather perceives the benefit to herself. Rowlandson has no mercy when she states:

> That night they bade me go out of the Wigwam again: my Mistrisses Papoos was sick, and it died that night, and there was one benefit in it, that there was more room.

Her attitudes seem to be changing based on the actual condition but even though she mentions in several parts that some Indian members provided her with great comfort, she generally seems to have no mercy with her Indian captors, especially with her mistress Weetamoo.

Let us now further proceed to another aspect of child captivity. It can be analyzed that the taking of young children or mothers with young children was a goal-directed and calculated strategy. The process of Indianizing began immediately upon capture as the tribe stripped the captive of all social relations and external cultural links with the society of origin. During this cultural testing period, Indians measured the captive's relative strength and qualities.[50] In general, the Indians preferred to adopt younger captives. Age played an essential role in the Indianization process its essential role. The younger captive might come to identify with the tribe so much as to be fanatically loyal to it. In general, younger children were more susceptible to demonstrations of affection from the Indian captors.

But it was not only age which had its decisive function. Indians seemed to select the individuals very carefully and the possession of specific qualities or skills or the demonstration of courage could have a special influence on the actual adoption. In order to persuade the captive to be happy enough in the tribe, to be adopted into the Indian family, or to marry one of its members, the Indian captors methodically exploited every aspect of the captivity experience for maximum psychological effect. Marriages resulting from captivity had important benefits for Indians, as they helped to maintain a tribe's members and lineages

[50] Ingersoll 57

by reproduction as the Indian communities were affected by a continuing decline of the whole population, especially its male members.[51]

Most captives, however, first dreamed of the possibility of escape out of anger, homesickness, and unfamiliarity with Indian culture. Nevertheless, most captives did not escape in part because they knew it was virtually impossible to retrace the path to their homes, in part because the Indians so strongly discouraged those who expressed a desire to leave. In some cases the captives might even feel restrained by a debt of gratitude.[52] On the other hand, however, there were members of the Puritan community who willingly chose to become members of the Indian culture. Some colonists found Indian society attractive and very practical. Many white even came to realize that Indian clothing was superior to European uniforms and shoes. Many frontier commanders therefore adopted Indian dress and moccasins; the latter were especially prized because they could be dried more quickly than shoes.

Some colonists even turned many Indian technologies to their own use in frontier warfare. Light birchbark canoes were excellent vessels for men moving quickly on inland waterways as one man could easily carry a five-passenger canoe on his back for several miles.[53] Despite the fact that many colonists profited from the fact that Indians could turn almost any material to practical use, the colonists who chose to adopt Indian culture were seen as renegades. The colonists were fascinated not only with the natural knowledge each Indian possessed but more importantly they admired its less exigent restraints. The white renegades becoming white Indians represented a profound threat to colonists' social security and cultural integrity. They could not only disrupt the colonial ideology but also the white blood "purity"

[51] Ingersoll 53
[52] Ingersoll 63
[53] Starkey 19

as they produced mixed-blood children. The extensive mixture could render whites' basic social structure incoherent.[54]

[54] Ingersoll 53

The Fur Trade

Talking about the perception and acceptance of the wilderness, William Bradford, when recording his history of the Pilgrim Fathers, recalled how the decision to move to the New World had been made according to contemporary expectations. The coming pilgrims believed they could receive no mercy from the Indian, who:

> Delights to tormente men in the most bloodie manner that may be fleaing some alive […] cutting of[f] the members, and joints of others […] with other cruelties horrible to be related.[55]

Similarly, when Rowlandson starts to depict her story to the readers, she starts *in medias res*, with the actual attack on Lancaster where almost everybody is "knockt in head" and the Indians keep "split[ing] open [the settlers'] bowels.[56] The fragile relationship between Native Americans and Puritan settlers was maintained by means of commercial bonds. Although the commercial relations involved a wide variety of goods as Native Americans had raw materials that were very highly valued in Europe, seventeenth century New England commerce was dominated by fur trade.[57]

Indigenous people, "the children of nature", were excellent hunters and the distribution of furs to white settlers could represent a very profitable business. The fur trade was, however, regulated by local governments, as can be seen in the following statements made by the General Court of Massachusetts:

[55] Kašpárek 54
[56] Rowlandson
[57] Kašpárek 63

> the trade of furres with the Indians in this jurisdiction doth properly belong to the commonwealth, and not unto particular person[s].[58]

Such regulations even further destabilized the fragile commercial bonds white settlers had established with the Natives. Later, however, as commercial motives and financial profit became more important than Christian salvation, fur trade with Indians was allowed to any holder of a license issued by the General Court.

The idea of property ownership was quite different to white settlers and indigenous people. Although they both comprehended the idea of property ownership, their approaches to it were inherently contradictory. The indigenous people were aware of the fact that white settlers' commercial interests were quite different from the Algonquian traditions and customs. The Europeans had learnt to deceive the indigenous people and made them barter the furs for items such as knives, combs, hatchets, looking glasses, or scissors. But the most appreciated item among the Native Americans apart from firearms was cloth. Cloth was so highly valued that it was even used as a "staple currency."[59]

The trading process was, however, defined by a very specific set of rules and limitations. In other words, the very trading process became a ceremony based on careful negotiation. According to Ann Carlos and Frank Lewis, etiquette required that trading be preceded by an elaborate gift-exchange ceremony between natives and their trading captain on one side and the governor and post factors on the other. Exchange formally began with the discharge of guns by the Indians on their arrival at the post, which was met by a response from the front cannons and the flying of the company flag. Then the two sides would meet

[58] Mario Gonzales in Kašpárek 63
[59] Ann M. Little, ""Shoot That Rogue, for He hath an Englishman´s Coat On!": Cultural Cross-Dressing on the New England Frontier 1620-1760", *The New England Quarterly*, Vol. 74, No.2 (Jun., 2001) <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185478> 240

outside the post and exchange gifts and the ceremony would be, of course, accompanied with ceremonial drinking and pipe smoking.[60]

The fur trade became one of the most important features of the development of Native-European relationships, in part because Europeans could supply the natives with a wide variety of goods that were new to Native Americans. Later, in the 1730s, a strong European market led to higher fur prices and Natives began purchasing many more luxury items.[61] Despite the fact that the Natives paid great attention to a variety of luxury items such as pistols, hats, beads, or shoes, much literature has been dominated by discussions of alcohol, although the reality was quite different. According to Ann Carlos and Frank Lewis, at least until the 1740s alcohol was unimportant. The natives spent more on kettles and firearms. It can be said that the portrayal of a drunken Indian was also embellished for the reading public, and it supported the idea that a Native American´s very nature is driven by a devil and thus it is important to be aware of his inner cruelty. In reality, the alcohol provided by the Europeans in the Hudson Bay region, for example, could have supported no more than light drinking.[62]

Even though alcohol became part of the commercial liaison among the Natives and the Europeans, it is estimated that in the early years, alcohol made up a very small percentage of the trade, less than five percent. In 1740, the trade in brandy and strong water had grown to 494 gallons; alcohol still amounted to less than ten percent of the value of all goods received.[63] In most years, the trade in alcohol was less than half the trade in tobacco. As was already mentioned, the Natives had a preference for blankets and kettles, and in 1740 purchases of blankets and kettles combined exceeded the purchase of alcohol. Even though alcohol was very often comprised in the gift-exchange ceremonies, it never exceeded twenty

[60] Ann M. Carlos and Frank D. Lewis, *Commerce by a Frozen Sea: Native Americans and the European Fur Trade* (Philadelphia, PA, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10576071&p00=ann+m.+carlos+frank+d.+lewis%2C+commerce+frozen+sea> 73
[61] Carlos and Lewis 168
[62] Carlos and Lewis 11
[63] Carlos and Lewis 92

or thirty percent.[64] Overall it can be stated that even though the portrayal of a demonized Native American drunkard was highly popularized, the trade of alcohol never was a crucial trade item and it was never the case that the Native groups were trading fur only or exclusively for alcohol.

[64] Carlos and Lewis 94

The Cloth Trade and Tribal Status

As was mentioned, the alcohol trade did not exceed the purchase of blankets and kettles, and it did not even exceed one other very important item, cloth. In 1740 the trade in cloth was more than twice that of alcohol.[65] Ann M. Little states that cloth was so highly valued that it was even used as a "staple currency." The appraised value of clothing and cloth items was, on average, over ten percent of the total value of the estate.[66] On the Anglo-Indian frontier, where Native peoples did not produce woven cloth, it also marked ethnicity.

Until late 17th century, English women produced little cloth domestically and Native people never did so. Consequently with the expansion the commodity held great economic and cultural value in the frontier region.[67] Cloth was valuable not because of the benefit of warmth and comfort but for the significance of identity. Based on the cloth it could be distinguished between bound and free, according to cut and fashioning between child and adult and because of the absence of woven cloth among Native Americans, between English and Indian.

Native Americans also used features of adornment on their dress but generally Native Americans wore a deer skin around their waste. Women, on the other hand, covered their nakedness with two deer or bear skins sewn together. The form of adornment then marked gender and age differences. With the progress of Euro-Indian trade, Native Americans started to wear European-made coats and shirts as well as drapping cloth and blankets around themselves as cloaks.[68] In the seventeenth century, New England´s magistry imposed sumptuary laws in an effort to control the use and display of fine fabrics, but the measures

[65] Carlos and Lewis 94
[66] Little 240
[67] Little 240-241
[68] Little 245-246

were rarely enforced. By the end of the century, fashionable dress could be worn by all who could afford it.[69]

The cloth did not have its role only in commercial liaisons but also in very self-identification and self-presentation among Native Americans. Algonquians and the Iroquois used dress and adornment to denote status and gender.[70] To keep friendly bonds with the Natives, some European settlers comprised in the gift-exchange the very European-style dress. This was first associated with high ranking Indians. William Bradford recalls in his journal that on the occasion of their first visit to Massasoit, sachem of Wampanoag, delegates from Plymouth Colony "gave him a suite of cloaths, and a horsemans coate, with some other small things, which were kindly accepted."[71] The clothing had, nevertheless, an important role in the very exchange of captives, as the English used cloth and clothing to compensate their Indians allies for delivering captive enemy Indians into their custody. The price of the captives was fluctuating over the course of time. In September 1675, for example, Connecticut agreed to pay four yards of cloth for every enemy captive delivered. Less than six months later, however, the cost had risen to two coats for every child or adult captive and one coat for a little baby.[72]

As the cloth had its importance, Rowlandson very often mentions in her narrative that she was praised for her ability to make shirts and that her skillfulness seemed to be popular with some of the Indians. Rowlandson consequently profits from her skill as she exchanges her work for food or shelter.

> During my abode in this place, Philip spake to me to make a shirt for his boy, which I did, for which he gave me a shilling. […] Afterwards he asked me to make a Cap for his boy, for which he invited me to Dinner.

[69] Little 242
[70] Little 244
[71] Little 250
[72] Little 250

> […] There was a Squaw who spake me to make a shirt for her Sannup, for which she gave me a piece of Bear. Another asked me to knit a pair of Stockins, for which she gave me a quart of Pease.

It is therefore evident that abilities and skills were highly appreciated among Indians.

Clothes were, nevertheless, not the only item that was used to define the status of the Native Americans. Hair also had its significance in the determination of social position in the tribe. Given the baldness of babies and old men, hairlessness was associated with powerlessness. Thus, boys were not allowed to grow their hair long or to dress it elaborately, as warriors did, with shells, beads, feathers, animal skins, furs, and bones.[73] Women´s hairstyles also differed according to life stages. Long hair on women indicated sexual maturity and marital status. Girls that were about to marry wore long bangs but once they were married, they cut their hair and until it grew out again, wore a head cover. Old women wore their hair elaborately decorated as the warrior did, while mourners showed their grief by cutting off their hair.[74]

[73] Little 244
[74] Little 246

The Hierarchy and Social Order

Being taken captive symbolized God's testing of one's faith and strength to overcome obstacles in the name of God. The brutality and fiendishness that the captives were about to experience were portrayed as contradictory to the moralities and behaviors prescribed for colonial men and fathers. As was mentioned, one of the potential threats was forced marriage to an Indian and consequent immersion into an Indian way of life. Mary Rowlandson's narrative seems to be, in some places, contradictory and inconsistent when describing her attitude towards her Indian captors, as we can perceive some instances of cultural blending and cultural accommodation in her text. Therefore, the dichotomy of civilization and savagery needs to be pointed out here.

The dichotomy between civilization and savagery is based essentially on the idea of otherness and exclusion.[75] Colonial Americans portrayed the Indian as an obstacle to civilization and further western settlement, and the inability to understand the very Native American nature led to the application of the term "savagism" – as a definition of the nature of this savage society.[76] Robert Cushman, for example, contributed in 1622 to false presumptions being created about Native Americans when he depicted Indians in this way:

> Their land is spacious and void, and there are few and do but run over the grass, as do also the foxes and wild beasts. They are not industrious, neither have art, science, skill or faculty to use either the land or the commodities of it; but all spoils, rots and is mared for want of manuring, gathering, ordering etc.[77]

[75] Steven G. Ellis and Luďa Klusáková eds., *Imagining Frontiers: Contesting Identities* (Edizioni Plus: Piza University Press, Pisa, 2007) 5
[76] Pearce 200
[77] In Pearce 202

It can be said that the Puritan writers were not interested in depicting the very nature of Native American and Indian culture but were interested, rather, in creating an image of the Indians' fallen spiritual condition.

Luďa Klusáková in her essay "A European on the Road" states that the dichotomy of civility and savagery is based on the cleansing of the "civilized" area by excluding all kinds of alterity and, in some cases, by demonstrative exclusion.[78] Klusáková says that this approach of excluding social groups has been defined by sociologists as pathological, in contrast to inclusive principles of the definition of belongingness. The contents and the forms of civility and savagery are unstable and reversible, influenced by the civilizing process and established by implication through the barrier of shame or legislatively imposed norms. In other words, Puritan writers and leaders saw Native Americans as a threat not only because of false presumptions and prejudices but also because of the strongly imposed European based social hierarchy. For much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, white settlers believed that based on their level of civilization, culture, and political organization, their social position was superior to that of indigenous people and therefore any form of acculturation or mutual integration was impossible.

According to Olga Seweryn, acculturation and ethnic identity can be defined in terms of specific dimensions. The first can be retention of or identification with the ethnic, or original, culture. The second can be adaptation to or identification with the dominant, host, or "new" culture, and the last, but not least, is identification with a third alternative: multiple cultures.[79] Furthermore, traditional conceptualization of acculturation presents a one dimensional approach, stating that individuals must lose cultural characteristics to gain characteristics from other cultural groups for cultural and social adaptation; this latter was one of the most intimidating prospects for Puritan/white captives.

[78] Ellis and Klusáková 5
[79] Olga Seweryn "identity Change as a Consequence of the Migration Experience" in Ellis and Klusáková 34

Contemporary conceptualizations take a multidimensional approach that places both cultures on different levels, assuming that an individual should be able to maintain his or her culture of origin while adopting characteristics from other groups. For some captives, adoption and immersion into Indian culture were so complete that they chose to remain, refusing redemption or release when offered.[80] It has to be, however, mentioned that most of these captives were taken captive at a very early age and quickly forgot their own culture. Leslie Fiedler mentions one of the first recorded examples in Anne Hutchinson's daughter, who was captured by Pequots in Connecticut in 1643 at the age of eight and during her four years in captivity, she forgot how to speak English and refused to be taken from the Indians. She was consequently returned to white civilization against her will.

It can be said that the captive, when acquiring a new culture and new traditions, went through a series of stages. The initial stage of separation or abduction was followed by a stage of transformation when the captive needed to suffer the ordeal, accommodation, or adoption, and the whole cycle was terminated with return, either through release, escape, or redemption. The very final phase could be furthermore supplemented with the deepest immersion into the alien culture. Richard Vanderbeets states that the final stage, the immersion, completed the initiation of the Hero symbolically "becoming" an Indian by ritualized adoption into the tribe.[81] There exist further data about the complete immersion and adoption of whites into Indian tribes. Father Jogues noted during his captivity that it was a custom of savages "when they spare[d] a prisoner's life, to adopt him into some family to supply the place of a deceased member."[82] Charles Johnson revealed that another function of Indian adoption was not only the replacement of the lost, but it symbolized a payment for killing a member of the tribe.[83] For whatever reasons, adoption was a widespread, and almost universal, practice among

[80] Vaderbeets 558
[81] Vanderbeets 558
[82] In Vanderbeets 559
[83] In Vanderbeets 559

American Indians that involved elaborate ceremony and ritual. Alternatively, it remained only for the captive to return to his former culture where they were given up for dead or considered "lost"; then received by friends and relatives as coming from the symbolic beyond.

One of the most preferred strategies of the majority of immigrants was that of integration. Integration meant a specific and appropriate cultural adaptation when immigrants maintained their ethnic and cultural identity regardless of whether they intended to take on the beliefs, attitudes, or behaviors of the host culture. Olga Seweryn, however, states that the integration strategy can be successful only if the conditions in the hosting society are favorable and when they offer an open and inclusive orientation toward cultural diversity.[84]

Mary Rowlandson's account is very much influenced by her Puritan background but her attitude towards her Indian captors changes throughout her narrative. In general, it can be stated that Rowlandson maintains her Protestant identity based on the fact that she is not willing fully to immerse into indigenous society and culture but at first tries to implement her Puritan superiority.

> I had often before this said, that if the Indians should come, I should choose to be killed by them then taken alive but when it came to the trial my mind changed; their glittering weapons so daunted my spirit, that I chose rather to go along with those (as I may say) ravenous Beasts […].

Subsequently, Rowlandson fails to defend her superior position among the indigenous people and starts to acknowledge the status of her "master". On the other hand, indigenous women are depicted as a projection of European and Protestant figures, thus according to Rowlandson failing to meet the standard. Her Puritan self-identity does not permit her to understand in any

[84] Seweryn 35

public way the distinct cultural demands and separate hierarchies that determine femininity in the culture with which she is forced to engage.[85]

As was mentioned, Rowlandson is consequently able to recognize the status of the leader, whom she calls "Philip", but struggles to define the status of her mistress. Rowlandson was taken captive in February 1675 during King Philip's War. The tribes were led by Metacom, who was known to colonists as King Philip, sachem of the Wampanoags, and Weetamoo, squaw sachem of the Pocassets – a title equated to Queen by most colonists, as sachem was to King. It is interesting that by ways of Providence, Rowlandson is taken captive and serves the very chief leaders of the tribe.

> In the morning when they understood that my child was dead they sent for me home to my Masters wigwam (by my Master in this writing, must be understood Quinnapin, who was a Sagamore, and married King Philips wife's sister; not that he first took me, but I was sold to him by another Narragansett Indian, who took me when first I came out of the Garison.

Rowlandson depicts her role as Weetamoo's slave but her mistress is portrayed as a failure to traditional female standards and Rowlandson does not acknowledge Weetamoo's public rank. Weetamoo was, however, considered to be one of the most powerful North American Indian women of the colonial era and therefore, her story deserves further note.

Weetamoo was known both as the warrior-leader and the squaw-sachem of the Pocassets. The title, power, and authority came from the status of birthright and her experience as warrior-leader came from familial alliances. During King Philip's War, Weetamoo was married to Quinnapin, the sachem of the Narragansetts, and her sister was

[85] Tiffany Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity: Mary Rowlandson's Narrative of Captivity," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* Vol. 36, No.2 (Winter, 2003) The Johns Hopkins University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30053358> 154

married to Metacom, the Wampanoag sachem. These marriages confirmed alliances and united the power of their tribes into a single extended family. Weetamoo gained further status among the Wampanoags by virtue of her having been the Wampanoag queen as the wife of the sachem Wamsutta, who was known to colonists as Alexander. At Wamsutta's death, the title of Wampanoag sachem moved to his brother Metacom, but Weetamoo retained the respect and confidence of the Wampanoag people, thus rendering her influence even greater than what she already had by her Pocasset title and her status as Narragansett Queen by marriage during the time of Rowlandson's captivity.[86]

Rowlandson keeps depicting Weetamoo with regard to her own idea of a woman's role and therefore even though Weetamoo is generally considered as a military threat, based on her role of a warrior-leader, and an authoritative figure, given by her Royal origin, Rowlandson compares Weetamoo to a lady of the "gentry" but declines to recognize her political and military roles as she is unable to accept the fact that a woman could have such roles in her society.[87]

> My master had three Squaws, living sometimes with one, and sometimes with another one, this old Squaw, at whose wigwam I was, and with whom my Master had been those three weeks. Another was Weetamoo, with whom I had lived and served all this while: A severe and proud Dame she was, bestowing every day in dressing her self neat as much time as any of the Gentry of the Land: powdering her face, going with Neck-laces, with Jewels in her ears, and Bracelets upon her hands: When she had dressed her self, her work was to make Girdles of Wampon and Beads. The third Squaw was a younger one, by whom he had two Papooses.

[86] Potter 154
[87] Potter 159, 161

Rowlandson's narrative on the other hand establishes three universally determining qualities of true and valuable femininity which are presented as sexual purity, maternity and gender.[88] As was mentioned, Rowlandson struggles to acknowledge Weetamoo as her mistress and very often highlights Weetamoo's demonstrated cruelty. Weetamoo is very often offended by Rowlandson's reading of the Bible:

> […] she found me sitting and reading in my Bible; she snatched it hastily out of my hand, and threw it out of doors; I ran out and catched it up, and put it into my pocket, and never let her see it afterwards.

On another occasion Weetamoo is offended by Rowlandson's manifestation of resistance:

> […] as I lay by the fire, I removed a stick that kept the heat from me, a Squaw moved it down again, at which I lookt up, and she threw a handfull of ashes in mine eyes; I thought I should have been quite blinded, and have never seen more.

Even though Rowlandson changes her attitude towards her captors towards the end of the narrative and she is even able to change the female standard or viewpoint, the story of Weetamoo and Metacom does not have a happy ending. Soon after Rowlandson's release, on 6 August 1676, a party of Indians was captured near Taunton, Massachusetts and later the body of an Indian woman was found in the same vicinity. Increase Mather then recorded that the English "cut off her head, and it hapned to be Weetamoo." On 12 August, shortly after his wife and nine-year-old son were captured to be sold into slavery in the West Indies along with many other captive Indians, Metacom was killed while trying to escape the English in Mount Hope peninsula. The officer in charge ordered him decapitated and quartered. The quarters

[88] Potter 157

were hung on trees, the head sent to Plymouth, one hand to Boston, and the other to the Indian who shot him.[89]

[89] Schrager Lang 311

Mary Rowlandson's Suffering

Based on her Puritan belief, Rowlandson depicts her suffering in captivity as a divine answer to her sinful life. Being a Protestant woman, she was expected to remain silent, but now, she stands up and reflects on her life in a written text. Her narrative furthermore performs a role in local conflicts over colonial legitimacy and authority.

Rowlandson very often depicts in her text the difficulties she had to undergo when being separated from her family and from her friends:

> [M]y thoughts ran upon my losses and sad bereaved condition. All was gone, my Husband gone (at least separated from me, he being in the Bay; and to add to my grief, the Indians told me they would kill him as he came homeward) my Children gone, my Relations and Friends gone, our House and home and all our comforts within door, and without, all was gone, (except my life) and I knew not but the next moment that might go too.

According to Teresa A. Toulouse the captive woman ideally demonstrates her own inability to do anything to restore herself. All she can do is to exhibit the appropriate female qualities like passivity, obedience, and dependence. Consequently, the captive woman turns to divine help; her belief in the Scripture which can finally restore her.[90] In every dreadful moment Rowlandson turns to her reading of the Scripture in which she finds inner peace. It is also interesting that she is able to liken any part of her captivity, any daily activity or miserable circumstances to some parts of the Bible:

[90] Toulouse chapter 2 41

> I then remembered how careless I had been of Gods holy time, how many Sabbaths I had lost and misspent, and how evily I had walked in God's sight […] and as he wounded me with one hand, so he healed me with the other.

Any time she feels that her prior deeds were not good enough or that she did not obey God's will, she perceives the captivity as a part of her punishment. On the other hand, it is through the very reading of the Bible that she perceives God's help:

> I opened my Bible to read, and the Lord brought that precious Scripture to me […] This was a sweet Cordial to me, when I was ready to faint, many and many a time have I sat down, and wept sweetly over this Scripture.

Nevertheless, even Rowlandson, wife of a Puritan leader, admits that there were times when even the Scripture could not give her peace and she was so desperately longing for being killed on the spot, thus ending her misery. In the middle of her narrative Rowlandson mentions that it seems to her that everybody disappointed her, even the Bible. There was no restoration for her in sight and she experienced strong despair:

> About that time I began to think that all my hopes of Restoration would come to nothing. I thought of the English Army, and hoped for their coming, and being taken by them, but that failed. I hoped to be carried to Albany, as they had discoursed before, but that failed also. I thought of being sold to my husband, as my master spake, but in stead of that, my master himself was gone,, and I left behind, so that my spirit was now quite ready to sink. […] Then also I took my Bible to read, but I found no

> comfort here neither, which many times I was wont to find. So easie a thing it is with God to dry up the Streams of Scripture-comfort from us.

Rowlandson's use of types is quite complex. Sometimes they are drawn upon for analogical as well as historical reasons, and sometimes, they are used in a way common in Puritan New England. In other words, Rowlandson uses types as a means of operating in the current historical moment, having thus an inscribed purpose. It is considered that Rowlandson's use of types is both supporting a particular kind of New English orthodoxy and rejecting orthodox attempts to typify Rowlandson's experience. By a particular kind of New English orthodoxy, is meant the reflection of her captivity into the American "new" Israel.[91]

Amanda Porterfield also comments on Rowlandson's use of types but highlights Rowlandson's manipulative attempts. Rowlandson identifies herself with the patriarchs of Israel and compares New England's sufferings to those of Israel, interpreting them as punishments for sins that enabled God's forgiveness. According to Porterfield, Rowlandson does not simply match her subjective experiences to stories and imagery from the Bible but rather manipulates biblical language as a medium that enables her to define and express her feelings.[92]

Rowlandson's captivity narrative focuses both on the nature of man and on society and culture. It is not only the providential design that we find in her narrative, but also the fate of an individual skillfully linked to the experience and fate of her people. Rowlandson furthermore highlights the lives of other sufferers as exemplary.[93] Rowlandson's narrative can be generally analyzed as a set of moral lessons and warnings, mirrored in the danger of divine wrath. Her suffering proves to be profitable as it leads to new reliance upon God. It is not only

[91] Toulouse chapter 3 "Deference and Difference: Female Captivity and Male Ambivalence" 56
[92] Amanda Porterfield, *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10142116&p00=amanda+porterfield> 138-139
[93] David L. Minter, "By Dens of Lions: Notes on Stylization in Early Puritan Captivity Narratives," *American Literature* Vol. 45, No. 3 (Nov., 1973) Duke University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2924608> 342

the actual condition which changes Rowlandson's attitude but also that she admits that she should not have dwelt on small troubles much but should have seized the day.

> The Lord hath showed me the vanity of these outward things. That they are the Vanity of vanities, and vexation of spirit; but they are but a shadow, a blast, a bubble, and things of no continuance. […] If trouble from smaller matters begin to arise in me, I have something at hand to check my self with, and say, why am I troubled? I have learned to look beyond present and smaller troubles, and to be quieted under them.

In each episode or event, it is not only the experience that Rowlandson focuses on, but each experience symbolizes a sign. Rowlandson finds parallels, analogues, and signs in almost every part of her captivity. As she takes the reading of experience and its interpretation seriously, Rowlandson is attentive to its details.

The Brutish Fiend

The common presuppositions and prejudices created by colonial settlers resulted in persecution of and aggression toward Indians. Later, during the Revolutionary War, one of the popular military toasts was: "Civilization or death to all American savages."[94] A more vicious formulation can be found in the statement of U.S. Cavalry General Philip Sheridan that "[t]he only good Indian is a dead Indian."[95] The mutual coexistence between indigenous culture and white civilization was in a very precarious position. As was mentioned, Puritan writers sometimes ignored any indications that the indigenous and white culture could live peacefully together. In the 1680s, for example, Daniel Gookin, also depicts in 1680s Indians as brutal and cruel devilish fiends.

> The Indians have been and continue to be – with a few Christianized exceptions, brutish and barbarous; they indulge in polygamy; they are revengeful; the men only hunt and fish and fight while the women cook and do a little planting; they are all thieves and liars and by now they have virtually all become drunkards.[96]

It has been, however, mentioned that alcohol was not such a devastating problem of Indigenous people as it might seem from literary sources.

In her narrative, Rowlandson depicts the Indian character as very changeable. Her Indian captors showed different attitudes towards their captives based on either the situation or the place where they camped. Rowlandson furthermore mentions that her Indian captors delighted in making fun of their captives and pretended friendliness in order to humiliate them.

---

[94] Quoted in Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1988) 51
[95] Quoted in Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (New York: Penguin, 1970) 170, 172
[96] Quoted in Pearce 208

> They all gathered around the poor Man, asking him many Questions. I desired also to go and see him; and when I came, he was crying bitterly, supposing they would quickly kill him. […] I asked him about the welfare of my husband […] Some of them told me, he was dead, and they had killed him: some said he was Married again, and that the Governour wished him to Marry; and told him he should have his choice, and that all persuaded I was dead. So like were these barbarous creatures to him who was a lier from the beginning.

The common presuppositions, however, derived from rituals and tribal practice. These were transformed into literary narratives and accounts in order to support belief in the fiendishness of Indians and the dissimilarity of their culture to white civilization. The most popular rituals and practices that can be found in narratives from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries are cannibalism and scalping. For tribes that practised it, cannibalism was a ritual of war and even in those instances, the eating of human flesh had its origins in deeply rooted primitive systems of magic. The practice of eating the flesh of an enemy derived from the belief that the eater could acquire the courage and strength of his victim. Blood drinking, on the other hand, was among many tribes considered generally salutary and often specifically medicinal.[97] As was mentioned earlier, Indians reveled in lying and it can be stated that through lies they partially maintained their role as cruel cannibals. Rowlandson mentions it in her narrative as well:

> [...] and here was an Indian of whom I made inquiry after him, and asked him when he saw [my son] : he answered me, that such a time his master roasted him, and that himself did eat a piece of him, as big as his

[97] Vanderbeets 550, 552

> two fingers, and that he was very good meat. […] I considered their horrible addictedness to lying.

The second mentioned practice, taking of scalps, was popularly believed to have originated with the American Indian, and it was in part a manifestation of older beliefs ascribing magical powers to the hair. Actually, there have been allegations that scalping was actually introduced by Europeans, Armstrong Starkey mentions that it seems established that taking of scalps was a pre-Columbian custom widely spread among American Indians.[98]Anthropologists attest the widespread primitive believe in the hair as the seat of the power and soul. Native Americans believed that the piece of scalp and hair carefully sliced from an enemy's head contained the victim's spirit. To take a scalp consequently meant to gain control over that person's spirit. Furthermore, the hair was also a principal feature of the primitive and pagan conception of the external or separable soul.[99]

Armstrong Starkey, however, mentions an interesting fact, that taking scalps was not only the practice of Indian tribes but also of European fighters. In the seventeenth century, European fighters copied Native American tribes and began to scalp their opponents, and the practice continued throughout the period of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The most troubling aspect of European involvement in scalping, according to Starkey, was the fact that the Europeans offered bounties for enemy scalps. Bounties, therefore, transformed scalping into a financial transaction and encouraged its further spread.[100]

[98] Starkey 30
[99] Vanderbeets 552
[100] Starkey 31

The Political Use of Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative

Even though Rowlandson's captivity narrative is highly valued for its historical data, it became obvious that her narrative should not be read simply as a commentary upon her prior experience with Native Americans and King Philip's war. As was already mentioned, Rowlandson was highly encouraged to publish the narrative by a prominent Puritan leader, Increase Mather, and its content was inserted in many ministerial sermons. Moreover, its initial publication and a number of later republications reveal some hidden purposes of such publications of Rowlandson's text, as a means of political and religious propaganda. Its publication and support by Increase Mather and ministers aligned with him indicates that they wished to use it to respond to internal, in other words colonial, and external challenges to their cultural control from Royal England; control of the construction of traditional and religious political authority in Massachusetts.[101]

Teresa A. Toulouse in her work *Captive's position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England* mentions that Rowlandson's narrative could be read in context, such as Edward Randolph's challenges to the Massachusetts charter and Increase Mather's debates with William Hubbard, in relation with the representation of the passive position of the woman taken captive, and with regard to her relations to her Indian captors. Similarly, her narrative represented the portrayal of her seizure and return which could be paraphrased to define and defend a range of older and emergent theological, social, and political readings of the procedures of the first Puritan leaders, commonly addressed as "fathers".

Even though Rowlandson's narrative achieved enormous popularity among Puritan readers, the position of women in Puritan society was not definitely responsive to the idea that

[101] Toulouse 16

a woman, and more importantly a woman writer, could represent an active leader. Rowlandson represented a colonial Protestant woman who had been brutally separated from her family, but manifested culturally highly appraised qualities of religious acceptance, humility, and obedience. When we deal with the position of a woman in Protestant society, it has to be mentioned that women were viewed, in this highly patriarchal society, as members subordinate to either their husbands, their fathers, or ministerial preachers. Their prescribed duty was to remain silent and private. Rowlandson's narrative thus, on the contrary, represents a very influential means of female independence and partial repugnance when it is presented to a wide audience.

Scholars have shown that colonial ministers were aware of the possible contradictions involved in allowing women to write or even to be presented as characters in public, heroic narratives. The inserted and applied propagandistic meaning, however, neutralized much of the previous animosity, as it was considered that these very narratives written by women could be effectively used in justifying and persuading their readers of certain political and religious beliefs.[102]

As was already mentioned, Puritan society was highly patriarchal. Social historians have argued that child raising in Puritan patriarchal society, with its emphasis on the physical and psychological enforcement of the fathers' control, necessarily created ambivalent children who experienced at once intense dependence on their parents and an intense hatred of them for denying them their own desires.[103] The essence of the social order lay in the superiority of husband over his wife, parents over children, masters over servants, and ministers and elders over congregation in the church. Family was meant as a stabilizing feature of the whole society, and when Rowlandson was taken captive and driven away from her family and relations, the whole Puritan society was symbolically on the edge of disruption. The taking of

[102] Toulouse 8
[103] Toulouse chapter 3 48

Rowlandson captive should not be read as simply disrupting the family but disrupting a particular bond and chain of subordinations which results in larger application in disruption of a particular kind of social organization.[104] Nevertheless, Rowlandson experiences even the disruption of the family as part of God's will:

> We had Husband and Father, and Children, and Sisters, and Friends, and Relations, and House, and Home, and many Comforts of this Life: but now we may say, as Job, Naked came I out of my Mothers Womb, and naked shall I return: The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away.

In disrupting this particular organization, Rowlandson's captors were disrupting the covenant which she and her husband Joseph made the day they were married. Teresa A. Toulouse mentions the importance of family bonds in Puritan society as one of the most influential unifying features of the whole organization, as all other institutions come from the family. When the family is attacked or even when some members are taken captive, other social institutions are also analogically attacked. Toulouse moreover remarks that these anxieties were common in the course of and after King Philip's War, not simply in response to the rage of war and the mental and physical displacement it caused, but also in the face of new local and international challenges to the social order as, for example, a group of (non-clerical) officers, the tithingmen, which was established between 1675 and 1679 "for the purpose of inspecting and re-inforcing family government."[105] Moreover, Rowlandson's text offered not only a representation of threats to the community's identity, but also a representation of the appropriate position to occupy in reestablishing and securing such identity.

[104] Toulouse 39
[105] Toulouse 39

As a faithful Puritan, Rowlandson had to find some hidden meaning in her affliction and uncover the spiritual failings that prompted her punishment. Her captivity was regarded as an especially forceful sign of God's displeasure with his people, the chosen ones. Even though we can perceive ambivalent and contrasting perspectives in the meaning of wilderness to early European and North American societies portraying wilderness as a threat, Puritans imply a more important and symbolic meaning to wilderness. Wilderness served also as a place where the Puritans could prepare for contact with God. It was an ideal place for testing one's own diligence and faith, since they had to overcome all the evil lurking in the wilderness. By undergoing this trying path they proved to be the "Chosen People."

The wilderness, as Rowlandson sees it, symbolizes on one hand an untracked, menacing place in which she is forced to travel and in which she is forced to find food and shelter, which very often causes great difficulties, but on the other hand, the wilderness is a spiritual and psychological "condition" into which Rowlandson projects her own personal significance.[106] Even though Rowlandson does not provide much of the depiction of the actual land, she gives detailed descriptions of her journeys through the wilderness; the "removes".

The removal or the trek served several purposes. It is considered that Indians carefully planned which captives they wanted to keep in their tribes and which captives they wanted to sell in exchange for some goods, and the trek itself helped the process of selection. First, the trek sorted out those men who would never make good warriors, and women who would not make strong wives to warriors, able to endure extreme conditions in time of war. The captives were expected to maintain the pace of the warriors and had to march 30 to 50 miles a day, very often without food or any kind of refreshment.[107] Second, the trek served to convince the captive that it was a long way home. In other words, the trek discouraged the captives' hope of escape. Third, the ferocity helped the captive appreciate the kindness of the adoptive family,

[106] Schrager Lang 23
[107] Starkey 18

which would facilitate Indianization.[108] The process of Indianization deserves further analysis and it is mentioned in other part of the thesis. It is also important to mention that Rowlandson does not find beauty in the wilderness, only terror and fear, as she calls her captors "ravenous beasts", "barbarous creatures", "merciless heathen", or "hell-hounds".

Nevertheless, indigenous cultures, which seemed to Puritans uncivilized, presented one of the major difficulties and obstacles to the Puritan idea of conversion and salvation.[109] Puritans showed very little respect for cultural diversity and turned out to be very intolerant of indigenous cultures. Some Puritan leaders made efforts to impose their own religious principles on the indigenous people but their misreading and misunderstanding of several Indian traditions, practices, and even culture resulted in the fact that they could never turn the Indigenous peoples into so-called "praying Indians" by mere imposing of their own laws and religious belief upon them. Many Indian practices were described by Puritans as in strong discrepancy with Puritan regulations, and, in the view of many Puritans, such practices, including polygamy, blasphemy, pagan idolatry, and other unacceptable aspects of Indian life, had to be repudiated. Rowlandson also includes the "praying Indians" in her narrative but emphasizes their changing attitude and cruelty:

> There was another Praying-Indian, who when he had done all the mischief that he could, betrayed his own Father into the English hands, thereby to purchase his own life. Another Praying-Indian was at Sudbury-fight, though, as he deserved, he was after-ward hanged for it. There was another Praying-Indian, so wicked and cruel, as to wear a string about his neck, strung with Christian fingers.

[108] Ingersoll 58
[109] Kašpárek 45

Recounting these dreadful moments, Rowlandson supports the idea that the Christianization process was not very efficient and satisfactory.

Conclusion

The exploration west disrupted the routine lifestyle of many Indian tribes. In the course of the 17th and 18th centuries, which were the analyzed periods of this study, many Indian tribes symbolized an obstacle in the expansion west. Puritan leaders even incited their followers to feel hatred towards Native Americans or ingeniously provoked fear in Puritan minds, which would consequently profess the original Puritan beliefs in a more devout way. White settlers considered the Indians to be a threat because they were not accustomed to the traditions and manners of Native Americans. Puritan misunderstanding and misconceptions of Native American conditions of life resulted in the opinion that Indians were inferior to Puritan settlers and that their culture needed to be civilized.

This thesis focused on the portrayal of Indians depicted in the representative text of Mary Rowlandson's narrative. The idea was to focus on Rowlandson's text with regard to its Puritan significance, its hidden spiritual and political potential and projection of Puritan beliefs, misconceptions, and prejudices. In order to be able to analyze Rowlandson's work, it was essential to outline the definition of the captivity narrative genre and the features of Puritan captivity narrative. It was not, however, intended to depict the captivity narrative genre in its full breadth, the differences in female and male approaches to the genre, and the differences in narratives based on facts and narratives based on fiction, as the thesis worked primarily with one particular text, Mary Rowlandson's *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*.

Captivity narratives did not provide only accounts of the suffering and torture of white settlers, but above all they also provided a useful device for the understanding of Native American culture and life of the period of first encounters of the two cultures: Native American and European. Indians possessed their lands according to natural right, a basis

which many white settlers could not accept, and Native American understanding of land and property ownership caused another misunderstanding among Puritan settlers. The Puritans therefore felt to be obliged to take over possession of the land and expressed their "superiority" in attempts at religious enlightenment. Rowlandson, as the wife of a ministerial preacher, projects Puritan beliefs in her narrative. Having been taken captive and thus having spent time with those “merciful creatures”, as she calls the Native Americans, she expresses two great dangers that the Puritans feared the most: complacency and pride born of excessive confidence of election and despair and anxiety born of failure of confidence of election.[110]

Rowlandson very often puts into opposition her life before she was taken captive and the period after her suffering. Being loyal to her Puritan conviction, she regards all the suffering she goes through is a part of God’s punishment for her lapses. Her suffering consequently seems profitable as it leads to new reliance upon God. When we read Rowlandson’s narrative we can perceive a certain sense of hidden specialness: her specialness. Rowlandson’s faith is tested through the suffering from which she is delivered by God’s will, and providence leads her to the final stage of Puritan conversion, assurance.[111] Even though Rowlandson’s narrative is considered as one of the first female travelogues, she gives little portrayal of the landscape and focuses primarily on the depiction of her mental processes. Captives were exposed to many adversities. Very often they had to walk long distances at a very fast pace, had to change camps quickly, and could not rest even at night. They were carried into territory which was unfamiliar both geographically and linguistically. Many Indians spoke no English, or only a version of American Indian Pidgin English which

[110] Minter 339
[111] Fitzpatrick 1

settlers called “broken English”. Consequently, captives had to learn a new kind of dialogue in order to survive in, for them, a hostile land.[112]

Captives isolated from their homes found it impossible to retrace the way back home or were even discouraged from trying to escape. Some of the captives therefore started to adapt to the Indian way of life. In chapters “Indians East and West of the Mississippi River” and “The Hierarchy and Social Order” we learned that the process of Indianization was very often an ingeniously elaborated device for gaining members of Indian tribes in order to avert possible Native American extinction. Many captives were taken at a very early age, and therefore the process of assimilation was without further difficulty. A female captive had to face many dangers. Her security was threatened by being removed from the social and cultural protection of her patriarchal society. Consequently, female captives could be defeminized by being raped or forced into marriage with an Indian.

White women had in general more at stake than male captives in marrying an Indian. Once they married a "pagan savage", they would lose their "virtue", and, above all, intermarriage would mean giving birth to children who would necessarily be Indians in the eyes of Whites, being thus segregated forever.[113] Mary Rowlandson, however, depicts no sexual offences during her captivity and stresses that the Indians never did her any harm if she was willing to obey their rules and traditions. Even though she does not want to submit to their control, she subsequently adopts some of the features of their life and tries to establish a certain position among other members of the tribe.

It is interesting that during the captivity we can see a shift in Rowlandson’s attitude towards trading with Indians. In the beginning of her narrative, she sticks to her Puritan conviction that Indians are brutal illiterate savages, but as the narrative progresses she

[112] Frank Shuffleton ed., *Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10142120&p00=shuffleton> 39
[113] Ingersoll 66

penetrates deeper into tribal relations. Many white settlers perceived that good relationships with Indians were essential to maintain commercial alliances and treaties. The fur trade was one of the most important fields of commerce in New England, and Indians, being skillful hunters, were its leading suppliers. The trading process was furthermore accompanied by a series of significant rituals. The trade was consequently preceded by a gift-exchange, which influenced further alliances. The thesis also stresses that the trade in alcohol did not play an essential role as has very often been depicted in literature or movies.

Mary Rowlandson herself does not depict any Indian drunkards in her narrative and mentions no occurrence involving alcohol during her captivity. Even though she tries to establish her own position in the complex social system of Indian tribes, she does not recognize the power of her mistress and recognizes only the rule of male Indians, whom she calls masters. The thesis, however, portrays Indian women as frequently much stronger in authority and powers than men. Her mistress, Weetamoo, is considered as one of the most powerful female warriors, whom Rowlandson on the contrary depicts as powerless and weak, projecting on Weetamoo her own patriarchal upbringing. In opposition to Rowlandson's conception of Indian women, the thesis outlines Weetamoo's origin, martial virtues, and embodiment of features of "cruelty" (as Puritans would have it) often characteristic of Native American females.

Crèvecœur, an oft-cited observer of American conditions during the 18th century, depicted the early settlers as "western pilgrims" who were obliged to use the potential of the new land - land which possessed epithets like "New Canaan", "The Promised Land", or "The Garden of Eden".[114] Settlers were impressed by the wilderness of the American Frontier but had to face a series of dramatic relations and cultural renegotiations. The civilization of white settlers advanced their own interests and traditions regardless of Indian traditions and cultural

[114] Crèvecœur

heritage. Through captivity narratives, we can nowadays penetrate into the minds of early Puritan settlers, try to comprehend their mental processes, try to understand their application of Puritan beliefs to Indian lifestyles, and analyze the consequences of Puritan settlement on that period of American history. Mary Rowlandson's account provides interesting insights into Native American lifestyles, which she contrasts with traditional patriarchal Puritan society from the point of view of a woman. Rowlandson's point of view enables her to depict the period of the clash of two inherently distinct cultures with regard to spiritual values. Her spiritual progress, however, moves from passive acceptance of God's plans towards active accommodation to the Indian world. Even though she returns to her Puritan society, her narrative provides us with an important device for better understanding the atmosphere in the Frontier region in the period of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Bibliography

Rowlandson, Mary. *Soveraignty and Goodness of God* <mih.umd.edu/eada/Huml/display.php?docs=rowlandson_narrative.xml>

Rowlandson, Mary. *Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson.* Project Gutenberg. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/851/851-h/851-h.htm>

Andrews, Williams, Kolodny, Annette eds. *Wisconsin Studies in Autobiography. Journeys in New Worlds: Early American Women's Narratives*. Madison, WI, USA: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10531134&ppg=6>

Brown, Dee. *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee.* New York: Penguin, 1970.

Carleton, Phillips D. "The Indian Captivity" *American Literature* Vol.15, No. 2 (May, 1943) Duke University Press <http://jstor.org/stable/2920419>

Carlos, Ann M., Lewis, Frank D. *Commerce by a Frozen Sea: Native Americans and the European Fur Trade*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010 <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10576071&p00=ann+m.+carlos+frank+d.+lewis%2C+commerce+frozen+sea>

Cave. Alfred. *The Pequot War*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.

Crèvecœur, Hector St. John de. *Letters from an American Farmer*. Project Gutenberg. <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/4666/pg4666.html>

Ellis, Steven G., Klusáková, Luďa eds. *Imagining Frontiers: Contesting Identities*. Edizioni Plus: Piza University Press, Pisa, 2007

Fitzpatrick Tara. "The Figure of Captivity: The Cultural Work of the Puritan Captivity Narrative" *American Literary History* Vol. 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1991) Oxford University Press <http://jstor.org/stable/489730>

Fussel, Edwin. *Frontier: American Literature and the American West.* Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Haberley, David T. “Women and Indians: The *Last of the Mohicans* and the Captivity Tradition” *American Quarterly* Vol.28, No.4 (Autumn, 1976) The Johns Hopkins University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2712539>

Haefeli, Evan, Sweeney, Kevin. ““The Redeemed Captive” as Recurrent Seller: Politics and Publication, 1707-1853” *The New England Quarterly* Vol.77, No. 3 (Sep., 2004) The New England Quarterly, Inc. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1559823>

Hine, Robert V., Faragher John Mack eds. *The American West: A New Interpretive History.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.

Ingersoll, Thomas N. *To Intermix with Our White Brothers: Indian Mixed Bloods in the United States from Earliest Times to the Indian Removes.* Albuquerque, NM, USA: University of New Mexico Press, 2005. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10492235>

Kašpárek, Jakub. *Puritans and Indians – Cultural Conflict in the 17th century New England* <https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/detail/88478>

Little, Ann M. ““Shoot That Rogue, for He hath an Englishman´s Coat On!”: Cultural Cross-Dressing on the New England Frontier 1620-1760” *The New England Quarterly,* Vol. 74, No.2 (Jun., 2001) <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185478>

Little, Ann M. *Early American Studies: Abraham in Arms: War and Gender in Colonial New Englan.* Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10492235>

McWilliams, John. *The Last of the Mohicans: Civil Savagery and Savage Civility*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995.

Milnes, O’Connor eds. *The Oxford History of the American West*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Minter, David L. “By Dens of Lions: Notes on Stylization in Early Puritan Captivity Narratives” *American Literature* Vol. 45, No. 3 (Nov., 1973) Duke University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2924608>

Pearce, Roy Harvey. “The *Ruines of Mankind*: The Indian and the Puritan Mind” *Journal of the History of Ideas* Vol. 13, No.2 (Apr., 1952) University of Pennsylvania Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2707611>

Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization.* Berkley: University of California Press, 1988.

Peskin, Lawrence. "Captives and Countrymen: Barbary Slavery and the American Public" John Hopkins UP, 2009 <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/docDetail.action?docID=10389803&p00=peskin>

Porterfield, Amanda. *Female Piety in Puritan New England: The Emergence of Religious Humanism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10142116&p00=amanda+porterfield>

Potter, Tiffany. "Writing Indigenous Femininity: Mary Rowlandson's Narrative of Captivity" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* Vol. 36, No.2 (Winter, 2003) The Johns Hopkins University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30053358>

Quinn, Justin ed. *Lectures on American Literature*, Praha: Nakladatelství Karolinum, 2011.

Schrager Lang, Amy ed. *Wisconsin Studies in Autobiography: Journeys in New Worlds.* Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press: 1990. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10531134&p00=schrager+lang>

Schrager Lang, Amy. *Mary Rowlandson.* Emory University <http://library.uvm.edu/~pmardeus/honors/dlbrowlandson1.pdf>

Shuffleton Frank ed. *Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/detail.action?docID=10142120&p00=shuffleton>

Siemenski, Greg. "The Puritan Captivity Narrative and the Politics of the American Revolution" *American Quarterly,* Vol. 42, No. 1 (Mar., 1990) The Johns Hopkins University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2713224>

Starkey, Armstrong ed. *European and Native American Warfare 1675-1815*. London: Routledge, 1998. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10054943&ppg=6>

Toulouse, Teresa A. *Captive´s Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England,* chapter 1 "Female Captivity, Royal Authority, and Male Identity in Colonial New England, 1682-1707". University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10748629&ppg=10>

Toulouse, Teresa A. *Captive´s Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England,* chapter 2 “The Sovereignty of Goodness of God in 1682: Mary Rowlandson´s Narrative and the “Fathers´” Defense”. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10748629&ppg=21>

Toulouse, Teresa A. *Captive´s Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England,* chapter 3 “Deference and Difference: Female Captivity and Male Ambivalence”. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10748629&ppg=30>

Toulouse, Teresa A., “My Own Credit”: Strategies of (E)valuation in Mary Rowlandson’s Captivity Narrative” *American Literature* Vol. 64, No.4 (Dec., 1992) Duke University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2927633>

Vanderbeets, Richard. “The Indian Captivity Narrative as Ritual” *American Literature* Vol. 43, No.4 (Jan., 1972) Duke University Press <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2924653>

Vaughan, Alden T. *Roots of American Racism: Essays on Colonial Experience*. Cary, NC, USA: Oxford University Press, 1995. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/reader.action?docID=10279471>